

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RALPH COUNTRYMAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICHARD GARCIA, et al.,

Defendants.

3:10-cv-00085- ECR-WGC

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed a Motion to Compel defendants to respond to discovery (Doc. #38) and a Motion for Hearing (Doc. #39) to which defendants objected. Defendant's Opposition (Doc.#41) is predicated on the proposition plaintiff's discovery should have been served more than 33 days prior to the discovery deadline to satisfy the deadline for completion of discovery. Generally speaking, defendants are correct. See, *Bishop v. Potter*, 2010 WL 2775332 (D. Nev. 2010).

However, as Judge Foley noted in the *Bishop* decision, "this requirement is not absolute." The Court further noted that because plaintiff therein served his interrogatories 31 and 32 days prior to the discovery deadline, "the Court can excuse the failure to comply with the deadline if it is not excessive." *Id*.

Herein, the deadline to complete discovery was August 22, 2011. Plaintiff's interrogatories and request for production were dated and served July 21, 2011. Although technically not within the discovery timetable, plaintiff's failure to comply with the deadline of one or two days "was not excessive." *Id*.

Case 3:10-cv-00085-ECR-WGC Document 42 Filed 10/20/11 Page 2 of 3

	Case 3:10-cv-00085-ECR-WGC Document 42 Filed 10/20/11 Page 3 of 3
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	To: Judge magistrate Cobb
·	
	This latter is a regulat that you make
	a suling on a; Motion to Compel de Fendants to
	answer discovery Pus. FRCP 37, AND motion
	For hearing (First request)
·	this motion was filed september 2, 2001
	and needs to be reded on before I can file
	sunnary Judgement.
	Please look into this matter
	Case # 3:10-CV-85-ECR-WGC
	<u> </u>
,-	Thank you
	Wei of the second secon
	Ralph Countryman 44564
	Pa Box 7000
	Carson City, NU 89707
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
·	
·	
	·
`	